ORIGINAL RECEIVED

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

is the optimal solution to the imbalances that exist in these market segments.

Moreover, Sprint is concerned that at least two petitioners define the "0+ public domain" solution so broadly as to affect practices of other carriers, including Sprint, that are not part of the problem. Specifically, LDDS (at 1) and PhoneTel (at 1) both define "0+ public domain" as requiring all issuers of proprietary calling cards either to limit the use of those cards to a proprietary access code, or to allow all other carriers to validate the calling cards. The difficulty that this broad formulation poses for Sprint and other IXCs that have always instructed their customers to use an access code, is that they have no way at present to block calls dialed "0+" -- contrary to their instructions -- from phones that are presubscribed to them, without also blocking the 10XXX code. The Report and Order (paras. 28-29, 31) noted that there is no way at present for an IXC to determine whether a call it receives was dialed on a 0+ basis or a 10XXX basis, and that the attainment of this capability would either take several years, or would impose significantly higher costs on IXCs, or both.

Thus, the practical effect of a broadly formulated definition of "0+ public domain" would be to require Sprint and other IXCs to abandon 10XXX as an access method for calling card calls, in order to eliminate the possibility of accepting 0+ calls. The Commission, in para. 32, found that such an abandonment "is clearly not in the public interest", and none of the petitioners contend otherwise. Such a result would be particularly punitive to an IXC, such as Sprint, that has recently begun utilizing

10XXX access for calling card calls, in addition to the 800 number it has relied on in the past, in an effort to mitigate the dialing disadvantages that it faces vis-a-vis AT&T for its calling cards. Sprint, and other similarly-situated IXCs, should not be forced to bear the brunt of solving a problem that is of AT&T's making.

Respectfully submitted,

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CO.

Leon M. Kesterbaum

H. Richard Junnke

1850 M Street, N.W., 11th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 828-7437

March 19, 1993

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing "Opposition of Sprint to Petitions for Reconsideration" of Sprint Communications Co. were sent via first class mail, postage prepaid, on this the 19th day of March, 1993, to the below-listed parties:

Cheryl Tritt, Chief*
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., #500
Washington, D.C. 20554

James Schlichting*
Chief, Policy & Program
Planning Division
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., #544
Washington, D.C. 20554

Gary Phillips*
Policy & Program Planning
Division
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., #544
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mitchell F. Brecher
Donelan, Cleary, Wood & Maser, P.C.
1275 K Street, N.W.
Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20005-4078
Attorneys for LDDS Communications,
Inc.

W. Audie Long Kenneth F. Melley U.S. Long Distance, Inc. 9311 San Pedro Suite 300 San Antonio, TX 78216 Kathleen B. Levitz, Deputy
Bureau Chief (Policy)*
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., #500
Washington, D.C. 20554

International Transcription Service* 1919 M Street, N.W., #246 Washington, D.C. 20554

Douglas F. Brent Associate Counsel LDDS Communications, Inc. 10000 Shelbyville Road Louisville, KY 40223

Gregory M. Casey Jane A. Fisher International Telecharge, Inc. 6707 Democracy Blvd. Bethesda, MD 20817

Mitchell F. Brecher
Donelan, Cleary, Wood & Maser,
P.C.
1275 K Street, N.W.
Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20005-4078
Attorney for PhoneTel
Technologies, Inc.

Genevieve Morelli Richard E. Wiley Vice President & General Counsel Danny E. Adams - 1 - 1 - -4